



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,510	08/26/2002	Takaaki Toyooka	8030-1001	4061
466	7590	08/27/2004	EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON			YEE, DEBORAH	
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR				
ARLINGTON, VA 22202			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/049,510	TOYOOKA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Deborah Yee	1742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address.
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 to 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada et al (US Patent 5,374,322) or Japanese patent 6-179945 .

3. Okada in claim 1 of column 19 and English abstract of JP'945, each disclose a steel tube for reinforcing an automobile door having a composition with constituents whose wt% ranges overlap or closely overlap those recited by the claims; such close approximation renders applicant's composition *prima facie* obvious because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select the claimed range from the broader disclosure of the prior art because the prior art has the same utility and similar properties, see MPEP 2144.05. Moreover, claims 2,3,4,7 and 8 are rejected for the reasons set forth in the previous office action dated March 9, 2004.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed July 6, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It was argued that Okada teaches 1 to 3.5 % Cr whereas the present invention requires 0 to 0.5%Cr. It is the examiner's position that claims 1 to 5 and 7 do not recite a Cr range and also because of its transitional phrase "comprising", the claims are open to unrecited elements (including Cr), even in major amounts. With respect to claims 6 and 8, they recite 0 to 0.5%Cr only as an optional element and is not required.

Also even if applicant amends claims to positively recite up to 0.5%Cr, such limitation fails to define patentable novelty over prior art whose lower limit of Cr is 1% because the difference is not of any patentable significance. Note that there is nothing to show that up to 0.5% Cr is critical or that it involves anything more than judicious selection. See page 8 of applicant's specification wherein Cr up to 2% is permissible.

5. It was argued that JP'945 does not meet the condition of "tensile strength of no less than 1000 Mpa but no more than 1400Mpa. It is the examiner's position that the English abstract of JP'945 discloses a tensile strength with a lower limit of 1470Mpa which is closely within applicant's upper limit of 1400Mpa. Since there is nothing to show that 1400Mpa is somehow essential or that it involves anything more than judicious selection, then claims would not patentably distinguish over prior art. Note that page 6 of applicant's specification discloses preferred tensile strength of no smaller than 1000Mpa but there is no disclosure of why an upper limit of 1400Mpa is essential.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deborah Yee whose telephone number is 571-272-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Deborah Yee
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1742

dy